

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 HELLER EHRMAN LLP,
10
11 Plaintiff,

No. C 14-01239 CRB

ORDER AWARDING COSTS

12 v.
13 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
14 LLP,
15 Defendant.

16 After the Court granted summary judgment, Defendant filed, pursuant to Federal Rule
17 of Civil Procedure 54(d), a Bill of Costs (dkt. 24) seeking a total of \$48,148.90. Now before
18 the Court are Plaintiff's objections (dkt. 27) to the Bill of Costs. Under Rule 54(d), there is a
19 presumption that the prevailing party will be awarded its taxable costs. See Save Our Valley
20 v. Sound Transit, 335 F.3d 932, 944 (9th Cir. 2003). To overcome this presumption, a losing
21 party must establish a reason to deny costs. See Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 178 F.3d 1069,
22 1079 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has specifically identified "extras" which are for
23 convenience of the lawyers and not properly billable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$13,918.62.
24 Plaintiff's other objections are OVERRULED. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to pay a
total of \$34,230.28 in taxable costs.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27
28 Dated: July 25, 2014



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE